

- (5) eye movement abnormalities;
- (6) difficulty walking;
- (7) tremors;
- (8) trouble eating and swallowing;
- (9) difficulties with other activities that require fine motor skills; and
- (10) death;

Whereas most patients with ataxia require the use of assistive devices, such as wheelchairs and walkers, to aid in their mobility, and many individuals may need physical and occupational therapy;

Whereas there is no treatment or cure approved by the Food and Drug Administration for ataxia; and

Whereas clinical research to develop safe and effective treatments for ataxia is ongoing; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the need for greater public awareness of ataxia;

(2) expresses support for the designation of September 25, 2022, as “National Ataxia Awareness Day”;

(3) supports the goals of National Ataxia Awareness Day, which are—

(A) to raise awareness of the causes and symptoms of ataxia among the general public and health care professionals;

(B) to improve the diagnosis of ataxia and access to care for patients affected by ataxia; and

(C) to accelerate ataxia research, including on safe and effective treatment options and, ultimately, a cure;

(4) acknowledges the challenges facing individuals in the United States who have ataxia and the families of those individuals; and

(5) encourages States, territories, and localities to support the goals of National Ataxia Awareness Day.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 6493. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. HAWLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6494. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6495. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6496. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6497. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6498. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6499. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 8404, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6500. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6501. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6482 submitted by Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SASSE, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 8404, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6502. Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 5796, to amend title 35, United States Code, to establish a competition to award certificates that can be redeemed to accelerate certain matters at the Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 6493. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. HAWLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Section 1738C of title 28, United States Code, as added by section 4, is amended by striking subsections (c) and (d) and inserting the following:

“(c) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘State’ has the meaning given such term under section 7 of title 1.”

SA 6494. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, beginning on line 3, strike “No person acting under color of State law” and insert “No State, territory or possession of the United States, or Indian Tribe”

On page 3, line 17, strike “person” and insert “State, territory or possession of the United States, or Indian Tribe”.

On page 3, strike lines 19 through 23.

On page 5, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 6, line 3, and insert the following:

(a) NO IMPACT ON BENEFITS, STATUS, OR RIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to

deny or alter any benefit, status, or right (including tax-exempt status, tax treatment, educational funding, or a grant, contract, agreement, guarantee, loan, scholarship, license, certification, accreditation, claim, or defense) of any entity or person—

(1) if such benefit, status, or right does not arise from a marriage; or

(2) if such potential denial or alteration would be based in whole or in part on the belief, practice, or observance, of the entity or person about marriage.

SA 6495. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, beginning on line 3, strike “No person acting under color of State law” and insert “No State, territory or possession of the United States, or Indian Tribe”

On page 3, line 17, strike “person” and insert “State, territory or possession of the United States, or Indian Tribe”.

On page 3, strike lines 19 through 23.

On page 5, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 6, line 3, and insert the following:

(a) NO IMPACT ON BENEFITS, STATUS, OR RIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to deny or alter any benefit, status, or right (including tax-exempt status, tax treatment, educational funding, or a grant, contract, agreement, guarantee, loan, scholarship, license, certification, accreditation, claim, or defense) of any entity or person—

(1) if such benefit, status, or right does not arise from a marriage; or

(2) if such potential denial or alteration would be based in whole or in part on the belief, practice, or observance, of the entity or person about marriage.

On page 6, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

(c) NO IMPACT FROM PARTNERSHIPS.—For purposes of this Act, and any amendment made by this Act, no faith-based organization shall be deemed to be a State, territory or possession of the United States, or Indian Tribe on the basis of any partnership the organization entered into with the State, territory or possession of the United States, or Indian Tribe.

SA 6496. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, beginning on line 3, strike “No person acting under color of State law” and insert “No State, territory or possession of the United States, or Indian Tribe”

On page 3, line 17, strike “person” and insert “State, territory or possession of the United States, or Indian Tribe”.

On page 3, strike lines 19 through 23.

On page 5, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 6, line 3, and insert the following:

(a) NO IMPACT ON BENEFITS, STATUS, OR RIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to